

असाधारण

EXTRAORDINARY

भाग II—खण्ड ३ — उप-खण्ड (iii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (iii)

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 37] No. 37] नई दिल्ली, बुधवार, अक्तूबर 3, 2001/आश्विन 11, 1923 NEW DELHI, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2001/ASVINA 11, 1923

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

अधिसूचना

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2001

आ.अ. 50(अ).—निर्वाचन आयोग वर्ष 1999 की निर्वाचन अर्जी संख्या 3 में जबलपुर स्थित मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के तारीख़ 24-11-99 के निर्णय और आदेश के विरुद्ध दाखिल की गई वर्ष 2000 को सिविल अपील संख्या 785 में तारीख़ 16 अगस्त, 2001 को दिए गए भारत के उच्चतम न्यायालय के आदेश को लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 116ग की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में इसके द्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

(आदेश इस अधिसृचना के अंग्रेजी भाग में छपा है।)

[संख्या 82/म.प्र.-वि.स./(3/99)/99] आदेश से, एल.एच. फारूकी, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2001

O.N. 50(E).—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub section (2) of Section 116C of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission of India hereby publishes the order of the Supreme Court of India dated the 16th August, 2001 in Civil Appeal No. 785 of 2000 filed against the judgement and order dated 24-11-99 of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur in Election Petition No. 3 of 1999.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal No. 785 of 2000

Bal Mukund Dewangan		Appellant (s)
,	Versus	
Pratima Chandrakar & Ors.		Respondent (s)
	ORDER	
This is an appeal in an election petition. Assembly Constituency No. 166, Khertha, District		election petitioner. He lost the election to the to the first respondent by a margin of 158 votes.
Before the High Court, it was contended of the ground of an alleged violation by reason of the Representation of People Act, 1951. The appellant a was established. At the polling station, Bijabhata, a reason that the presiding officer, one Mandavi, ha polling booth. Sahu had distributed ballot papers Mandavi had been replaced as a presiding officer at examination, one of the witnesses on behalf of the about 10,00 a.m.	he non-adjournment of the and the respondent led even to voting took place betward permitted the local past to voters so folded that the about 1.30 p.m. and the	vidence before the High Court and the following ween 11.00 a.m. and 1.35 p.m. This was for the inchayat secretary, Virendra Sahu, to sit in the the votes were likely to be rendered invalidates areafter polling had recommenced. In the cross-
The High Court observed, "If Virendra Saleft the Polling station at 10 a.m. there was no justiff found that Section 57 was not attracted and the ele	fication to adjourn the pol	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Section 57 provides for the adjournment of the proceedings at any polling station are interested is not possible to take the poll at any polling station the presiding officer shall announce an adjourn should have been adjourned because the proceeding on account of sufficient cause.	errupted or obstructed by n on account of any ment of the poll". The	natural calamity, or any other sufficient cause he argument is that, in the present case, the poll
We are inclined to agree with the High Couthe interruption or obstruction of the poll thereafter sufficient casue.		t the polling station, which he did at 10.00 a.m., d 1.35 p.m., cannot be said to be on account of
The civil appeal is dismissed.		
No order as to costs.		
		J.
		(S.P. Bharucha)
		J.
		(Y.K. Sabharwal)
		J.
		(Brijesh Kumar)
New Delhi,		(
August 16, 2001		INT- 92 A ID 1 A 1/2/900/001
		[No. 82/MP-LA/(3/99)/99]
		By Order, L.H. FARUOL Secv
		L.H. PARUUL SCCV